

CLEMENT SETH ROBERTS (SBN 209203)  
croberts@orrick.com  
BAS DE BLANK (SBN 191487)  
basdeblank@orrick.com  
ALYSSA CARIDIS (SBN 260103)  
acaridis@orrick.com  
ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE LLP  
The Orrick Building  
405 Howard Street  
San Francisco, CA 94105-2669  
Telephone: +1 415 773 5700  
Facsimile: +1 415 773 5759

SEAN M. SULLIVAN (*pro hac vice*)  
sullivan@ls3ip.com  
MICHAEL P. BOYEA (*pro hac vice*)  
boyea@ls3ip.com  
COLE B. RICHTER (*pro hac vice*)  
richter@ls3ip.com  
LEE SULLIVAN SHEA & SMITH LLP  
656 W Randolph St., Floor 5W  
Chicago, IL 60661  
Telephone: +1 312 754 0002  
Facsimile: +1 312 754 0003

*Attorneys for Sonos, Inc.*

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

SONOS, INC.,  
  
Plaintiff and Counter-Defendant,  
  
v.  
  
GOOGLE LLC,  
  
Defendant and Counter-Claimant.

Case No. 3:20-cv-06754-WHA

Consolidated with  
Case No. 3:21-cv-07559-WHA

**DECLARATION OF COLE B.  
RICHTER IN SUPPORT OF  
GOOGLE'S ADMINISTRATIVE  
MOTION TO CONSIDER WHETHER  
ANOTHER PARTY'S MATERIAL  
SHOULD BE SEALED (DKT. 689)**

I, Cole B. Richter, declare as follows and would so testify under oath if called upon to do so:

1. I am an attorney with the law firm of Lee Sullivan Shea & Smith LLP, counsel of record to Sonos, Inc. (“Sonos”) in the above-captioned matter. I am a member in good standing of the Bar of the State of Illinois. I have been admitted *pro hac vice* in this matter. I make this declaration based on my personal knowledge, unless otherwise noted. If called, I can and will testify competently to the matters set forth herein.

2. I make this declaration in support of Google LLC’s (“Google”) Administrative Motion to Consider Whether Another Party’s Material Should be Sealed filed on May 8, 2023 (Dkt. 689) (“Administrative Motion to Consider”), in connection with Google’s Objection to Sonos’s Demonstrative Disclosures For Mr. James Malackowski (“Google’s Objection”).

3. Sonos seeks an order sealing the materials as listed below:

Document	Portions Google Sought to Be Filed Under Seal	Portions Sonos Seeks to Be Filed Under Seal	Designating Party
Google’s Objection	Portions highlighted in blue	Portions highlighted in blue on pages 1 and 3	Sonos
Exhibit 1 to the Declaration of Lindsay Cooper in Support of Google’s Objection	Entire Document	Entire Document	Sonos
Exhibit 2 to the Declaration of Lindsay Cooper in Support of Google’s Objection	Entire Document	Entire Document	Sonos
Exhibit 3 to the Declaration of Lindsay Cooper in Support of Google’s Objection	Entire Document	Entire Document	Sonos

4. I understand that the Ninth Circuit has recognized two different standards that may apply to a request to seal a document, the “compelling reasons” standard and the “good cause”

1 standard. *Blessing v. Plex Sys., Inc.*, No. 21-CV-05951-PJH, 2021 WL 6064006, at \*12 (N.D.  
 2 Cal. Dec. 22, 2021) (citing *Ctr. For Auto Safety v. Chrysler Grp., LLC*, 809 F.3d 1092, 1096-97  
 3 (9th Cir. 2016)). The compelling reasons standard applies to any sealing request made in  
 4 connection with a motion that is “more than tangentially related to the merits of a case.” *Id.*  
 5 Accordingly, I understand courts in this district apply a “compelling reasons” standard to a  
 6 sealing request made in connection with a motion for summary judgment. *See, e.g., Snapkeys,*  
 7 *Ltd. v. Google LLC*, No. 19-CV-02658-LHK, 2021 WL 1951250, at \*2 (N.D. Cal. May 14, 2021).

8 5. I further understand that confidential technical information about product features,  
 9 architecture, and development satisfies the “compelling reason” standard. *See Delphix Corp. v.*  
 10 *Actifio, Inc.*, No. 13-cv-04613-BLF, 2014 WL 4145520, at \*2 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 20, 2014) (finding  
 11 compelling reasons to seal where court filings contained “highly sensitive information regarding  
 12 [an entity’s confidential] product architecture and development”); *Guzik Tech. Enters., Inc. v. W.*  
 13 *Digital Corp.*, No. 5:11-CV-03786-PSG, 2013 WL 6199629, at \*4 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 27, 2013)  
 14 (sealing exhibit containing “significant references to and discussion regarding the technical  
 15 features” of a litigant’s products). Under this “compelling reasons” standard, the Court should  
 16 order the above-listed documents sealed.

17 6. The portions identified in the table above for Google’s Objection and Exhibits 1, 2  
 18 and 3 to the Cooper Declaration reference and contain Sonos’s confidential business information  
 19 and trade secrets, including the details of Sonos’s confidential licenses and license offers with  
 20 third parties, including Google. Sonos’s licensing practices, history, and previous license  
 21 agreements are all confidential information that Sonos does not share publicly. Thus, public  
 22 disclosure of such information may lead to competitive harm as Sonos’s competitors could use  
 23 these details to gain a competitive advantage in the marketplace. A less restrictive alternative  
 24 than sealing said documents would not be sufficient because the information sought to be sealed  
 25 is Sonos’s confidential business information and trade secrets and Google contends that this  
 26 information is necessary to Google’s Brief. *See* Declaration of Lindsay Cooper in support of  
 27 Google’s Objection (Dkt. 690-1) ¶¶ 2-4.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct to the best of my knowledge. Executed this 15th day of May, 2023 in San Francisco, CA.

---

COLE B. RICHTER